1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO
3	
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
5	vs. No. 1:18-CR-3495-JCH
6	DOUGLAS SMITH
7	
8	
9	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
10	SENTENCING HEARING
11	November 10, 2022
12	
13	BEFORE: HONORABLE JUDGE JUDITH C. HERRERA UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
14	
15	
16	
17	Proceedings reported by stenotype.
18	Transcript produced by computer-aided
19	transcription.
20	
21	
22	
23	
2 4	
25	

```
1
    APPEARANCES:
 2
    FOR THE PLAINTIFF:
 3
               OFFICE OF THE U.S. ATTORNEY
               P.O. Box 607
 4
               Albuquerque, New Mexico 87103
               505-346-7274
                  NOVALINE WILSON
 5
               BY:
               novaline.wilson@usdoj.gov
 6
                    KYLE NAYBACK
               kyle.nayback@usdoj.gov
 7
 8
    FOR THE DEFENDANT:
 9
               OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC DEFENDER
               111 Lomas Boulevard NW, Suite 501
10
               Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102-2373
               505-346-2489
                    ARIC GRANT ELSENHEIMER
11
               aric elsenheimer@fd.org
12
                    AMANDA LAVIN
               amanda lavin@fd.org
13
14
                           INDEX
15
                                                   PAGE:
16
    Certificate of Reporter
                                                     35
17
18
19
20
21
2.2
23
24
25
```

```
THE COURT: Good afternoon. We will go on
 1
 2
    the record in USA versus Douglas Smith, Case
 3
    Number CR-18-3495.
 4
              And appearances, please, for the record.
 5
              MS. WILSON: Good afternoon, Your Honor,
 6
    Novaline Wilson and with me at counsel table is Kyle
 7
    Nayback on behalf of the United States.
 8
              THE COURT: Good afternoon.
 9
              MR. ELSENHEIMER: Good afternoon,
10
    Your Honor, Aric Elsenheimer and Amanda Lavin on
    behalf of Mr. Smith.
11
12
              THE COURT: Good afternoon to all of you.
13
              So we are here today to conclude the
14
    sentencing hearing. We got through the entirety of
15
    the hearing so I have heard argument from everybody,
16
    took up the objections, did all of that.
17
              The one remaining issue has to do with the
    consideration of the defendant's age and the impact
18
19
    that could have, would have on sentencing.
20
    have reviewed the materials that all of you provided
21
    the Court and so at this time if you have any
2.2
    argument you would like to make, I will hear from
23
    you.
24
              MR. ELSENHEIMER: Would you like me to
25
    begin, Your Honor?
```

```
1
               THE COURT:
                           If you would like to begin,
 2
              Somebody has got to start, right?
    you may.
 3
               MR. ELSENHEIMER:
                                 I quess I will start.
 4
               THE COURT:
                           You may proceed.
 5
               MR. ELSENHEIMER:
                                 Thank you, Your Honor.
 6
    Just to, I know you know a lot about this case.
 7
               Just to recap, Mr. Smith is 72 years old.
 8
    He has lived in Espanola his entire life and in the
 9
    house he lived, virtually his entire life since
10
    elementary school. His age provides a variance, a
11
    justification for a variance in this case.
12
    guidelines recognize the basis for variance where
13
    somebody is elderly and infirm and where home
14
    confinement can be equally efficient and less costly
15
    than incarceration, and that's the case that we have
16
    here.
17
               There are a number of examples, and I
18
    refer to these in the supplement to our sentencing
19
    memorandum.
                 But there are a number of examples
20
    where Courts have recognized age as a basis for a
21
    variance.
               There is U.S. v. White, which is a Tenth
2.2
    Circuit case citing defendant's advanced age, who
23
    was 76 in deciding to vary downward from the
24
    quidelines.
25
               There is U.S. v. Anderson this is a
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

```
District Court case from Arkansas for 56-year-old
defendant for a variance based on age, health
problems, lack of criminal history and substance
abuse problems.
          There is U.S. v. Flemister, which is a
Pennsylvania case noting a downward variance for
somebody's age and where there is an overstatement
of criminal history. We don't even have an
overstatement of criminal history because Mr. Smith
has no criminal history.
          And lastly Bellamy, which is a District
Court case in Minnesota that is a compassionate
release issue but granting compassionate release
based on somebody's age.
          There are a host of other examples.
                                               These
are four illustrative examples of how age is a basis
for a variance.
          Mr. Smith is 72 years old and what we are
talking about here is punishment. Rehabilitation is
not a sentencing at issue, really, deterrence isn't
at issue in this case. Mr. Smith has been out on
conditions of release without incident for
three years, gosh, no, I'm sorry, four years now.
What we are talking about is punishment and there
```

are other alternatives to incarceration for

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

There is home confinement that can punishment. serve as a significant restriction on Mr. Smith's liberty that can accomplish the purposes of sentencing and that are justified based on his age. There is two, I think, overwhelming factors that support a variance because of Mr. Smith's age. First of all is what he would face in the Bureau of Prisons if incarcerated. He would be going into the Bureau of Prisons with zero experience in custody, zero experience in understanding the routines and the culture of incarceration. And that increases his exposure and vulnerability to being taken advantage of by other inmates, other inmates who are far more savvy and aware of the culture of prison that would be able to take advantage of Mr. Smith. He is somebody who has not spent much time even outside of Espanola let alone in the hardened confines of jail or prison. He is not going to be able to understand that world and he is going to be taken advantage of. We reference these in our sentencing memorandum. There are even Department of Justice statistics that discuss how somebody of an advanced

age, and by advanced age what they are talking about

```
is over 50. In somebody like Mr. Smith at 72 he is going to be taken advantage of. It is that vulnerability his age and his complete lack of experience in incarceration where he will be taken advantage of and that justifies a variance from the guidelines.
```

2.2

And part of that is also the fact that going into a new environment is going to increase significantly the stress that Mr. Smith is under. We gave to the Court medical records that we just recently received this week. I gave them to the Probation Office and I sent them to your CRD, but what I want to point out in there is Mr. Smith has tachycardia, which is a rapid heart rate. That is something that he's recently experienced. We don't know the underlying cause, but I am pretty confident in saying it is because he is stressed about going into prison.

What we know about somebody who is at an advanced age is that stress and health problems compound each other, once one health problem starts, other health problems follow.

Mr. Smith going into prison is going to be a significantly higher stress than others going into prison who are even younger. Because of his age,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

less able, less resilient to the health problems he is going to run into in prison. So that increase in stress is going to lead to additional health problems. I point that out along with his vulnerability because it highlights the fact that he is going into prison at an age where most people don't move at all, most people don't make any changes in their lives. He is making a change from something that he has always known, one place that he has always known to something he has zero familiarity with. And that is going to increase his vulnerability to others, the stress just in that change in life and the fact that that stress is going -- and we know that stress causes health problems. People who are stressed out in their life have more health problems. It is going to compound his health problems and justifies a variance to something that is punishment but less severe than the punishment that somebody who is 72 is going to experience in custody. He has a lifetime of good behavior. peaceful. He does not have a background that will help him transition into a life in prison, and that justifies a variance. I understand any situation where we were concerned about keeping the community

2.2

safe where prison might be appropriate, but that is not the case that we have here. There is no concern about the community or about deterrence or about protection of anybody else.

Mr. Smith is a peaceful, law-abiding person who made a mistake and is in this situation because of a terrible accident. It wasn't, it is not something that has characterized his life. In fact, it is a deep aberration from everything else in his life. What we are talking about in this case is not deterrence, it is not rehabilitation, it is punishment.

If punishment can be accomplished in a less -- in something, in an alternative form such as home confinement, the guidelines and, I'm sorry, 3553 requires the Court to consider that as an alternative to punishment if it can be, if it accomplishes the goals of sentencing.

And home confinement in this case imposes punishment but it is less severe than what Mr. Smith would face in prison. It accomplishes the goals of sentencing because it sends a message that this is not, that those in Mr. Smith's situation have to be careful but it doesn't do so in a way that is going to potentially put Mr. Smith at risk of being

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

```
victimized by others in prison and a risk of health
problems that he is going to run into when he gets
              It is going to curtail his liberty in
into prison.
a way that punishes him but punishes him in a way
that is just under 3553.
          I think a sentence of home confinement 12
months, 18 months of home confinement is a
significant deprivation of liberty and is called for
by 3553 when we look at all of the factors.
led to this case, the fact that Mr. Smith was not
out looking for trouble, he was home in bed. And
the fact that he is 72 years old with no criminal
history. An absolutely aberrant situation.
not plan on this, he did not intend this to happen.
It is completely aberrant and given his age and what
he would face if he were to go into prison, it
justifies a sentence to home confinement, 12 months,
18 months.
          We will leave that to the Court's
discretion, but home confinement is punishment but
it is punishment that is fair and just under 3553(a)
that accomplishes the purposes of sentencing and it
is not greater than necessary.
          And I would ask Your Honor to consider and
```

to impose a sentence of home confinement.

```
fair in this case. This is a very difficult case.
 1
    It is difficult for everybody involved but sending
 2
 3
    Mr. Smith to prison is not the way that the
 4
    Sentencing Reform Act contemplates punishing
 5
    somebody in situations like this given their age and
 6
    everything that preceded that; no criminal history,
 7
    the facts and circumstances of this case and the
 8
    consequences to Mr. Smith if he goes to prison and
    the vulnerability that he will face with others
 9
10
    there having no experience in prison and the
11
    potential just stress and health consequences he
12
    will face in prison.
13
               Thank you.
14
               THE COURT:
                           Thank you, Mr. Elsenheimer.
15
               Ms. Wilson.
16
               MS. WILSON: Your Honor, just to address a
17
    few things that defense brought up. I realize when
18
    Your Honor does sentence people to Federal prison,
19
    sometimes it is people's first time to go to Federal
20
    prison.
21
               The fact that Mr. Smith doesn't have any
2.2
    experience in that regard shouldn't really be a
23
    consideration before this Court. It is stressful.
24
    I can only guess what that must feel like, and I am
25
    sure other folks who go to prison feel that same
```

stress. But to the extent that any health problems that may arise from that, of course, the United States has no objection that defendant be sent to a Federal medical facility.

2.2

We have included a number of exhibits on our response to defendant's request so the Court is comfortable with what resources are available at BOP specifically addressing not only his eye vision that was mentioned in defendant's pleading, but also the resources that are available for somebody who is an older person in prison. They have a policy, there are a number of resources that we included for the Court's consideration in, you know, reaching out to the BOP in determining what resources they had available.

They are aware that Mr. Smith is being sentenced and that this proceeding is taking place. And to the extent it would be helpful, you know, if we can put something in the Court's order that he go to a Federal medical facility but we can also -- BOP has mentioned to me that they will be sure that that facility he goes to is aware of his health conditions, whatever they may be, and that he receives the care that he needs. I have been reassured by BOP staff that that is something that

we can put in the order and that his healthcare will be taken care of.

2.2

In response to defendant's arguments about deterrence, we would argue that it isn't just punishment. There is an aspect of deterrence in Mr. Smith's sentence, both general and specific. The defendant, as Your Honor is aware, did admit to shooting at other people on his property. In this instance, of course, it did cost Ms. Gallegos her life, but, you know, there is that prior act. We are concerned and we do believe a custodial sentence is appropriate.

The United States maintains that defendant has not shown that his age or his health are exceptional, arise to the level to warrant a variance. Again, the BOP is fully capable of providing the defendant the care he needs and also can address his concerns with vulnerability.

Some of the documents we included for the Court include, you know, folks that can help people who are disabled in custody. And, again, you know, if the Court has any questions about any of the exhibits the United States provided, we would rely on our pleadings for our response to defendant's expert about his concerns about defendant's age and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

```
vulnerability. We just believe that the BOP is
capable of taking care of Mr. Smith.
                                      They take care
of people with far worse conditions and people who
are elderly on a daily basis.
          And with the information that we provided
for the Court, we hope that you have a good
understanding of what is there and that you would be
comfortable sentencing him to a custodial sentence.
          Happy to answer any questions you might
have, Your Honor.
          THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Wilson.
          Anything further?
          MR. ELSENHEIMER: Two things in response
very quickly, Your Honor. First of all just to be
clear, our argument isn't that the BOP doesn't have
the capacity to take care of these things. Our
argument and the justification based on Mr. Smith's
age is that Mr. Smith going to the Bureau of
Prisons, given his age complete lack of criminal
history, total inexperience with the prison will
lead to health problems and problems to him based on
his vulnerability to victimization.
          It is not that his conditions as they are
can't be addressed by the Bureau of Prisons, it is
that he is going to have adverse health
```

```
consequences, adverse life consequences by going
 1
 2
    into incarceration at his age.
 3
              The second thing I want to point out is
 4
    that -- the second thing I want to mention about
 5
    what the Government just said -- I am drawing a
 6
    blank on it right now.
 7
              THE COURT: Talked about first time,
 8
    everybody has a first time, health, deterrence is an
 9
    issue. BOP, exhibits to their response. Nothing?
10
    Not jogging it?
11
              MR. ELSENHEIMER: Well, I quess it was
12
    just one thing I had to point out, which is that --
13
    I want to make sure. Sure, the BOP can handle what
14
    he has right now but he will have adverse
15
    consequences to his health and to his lifestyle by
16
    going into the Bureau of Prisons.
17
              And by lifestyle I mean his victimization
18
    by others who are far more savvy. Folks who have
19
    spent their life in prison are extraordinarily
20
    savvy. You have to be on constant quard with them.
21
              Mr. Smith has none of that. He is not
2.2
    experienced in any way. He is not somebody who has
23
    spent his life traveling and understands. He spent
24
    his life living in his home in Espanola and that
25
    justifies a variance in this case.
```

```
And age, oh, the last thing, I know what I
 1
 2
    wanted to say.
                    The Government there is exceptional
 3
    reasons that we need. Age itself is identified in
 4
    3553 as a basis that the Court has to consider.
 5
    is identified in the guidelines as a basis. It is
    identified in case law as a basis for a variance,
 6
 7
    age itself.
 8
              It is inherently a possible basis for a
 9
    variance, particularly in a situation like
10
    Mr. Smith's. We don't have to show an analysis of
11
    exceptional circumstances or reasons, it is the age
12
    alone and the consequences based on someone's age.
13
    That is the justification for a variance.
14
              THE COURT: I am looking at 3553 to see
15
    where age specifically is.
16
              MR. ELSENHEIMER: It is history and
17
    characteristics, Your Honor.
18
              THE COURT: Well, history and
19
    characteristics, yes, I agree with you but I don't
20
    see age.
21
              All right. Anything else?
2.2
              MR. ELSENHEIMER:
                                 No.
23
              THE COURT: Well, I have reviewed all of
24
    the material that you-all have supplied on this
25
    issue of age and of variance.
                                    I have, I told you
```

when we were together last time that I was inclined to go with a guideline sentence at the low end.

2.2

As the hearing progressed I allowed the defense to submit any other materials or argument on the issue of age because, as I pointed out at our last hearing, while age was mentioned by the defense in the sentencing memo, there was really nothing that was particularly specific about age and so now the defense has provided more information.

Despite that information, I continue to believe that a custodial sentence is appropriate at the low end of the guidelines. I looked at the age issue very carefully because I can certainly understand that a custodial sentence for someone of, you know, a lot of ages, including 72, would be difficult and so I wanted to give every consideration to the defendant's request.

And I did look at all the issues that were identified. I looked at the report from the expert who, by the way, noted that the older population had increased significantly since 2009. I believe he said 25 percent so it was quite, it was a jarring number to see that the population of the older inmates had grown so dramatically.

But anyway, I looked through all of that.

2.2

```
I looked through the materials that the Government provided, and I continue to believe that the Bureau of Prisons is equipped to address issues that involve not only an inmate's age but also any health conditions.
```

Now the only health condition that I was aware of before yesterday was macular degeneration. I believe that the Bureau of Prisons is equipped to handle inmates who have vision issues, including macular degeneration.

Yesterday, I received a packet of materials from defense counsel regarding an emergency department visit to Presbyterian, I believe, and the defendant went to the emergency room about a week or so after we were together last time.

And from my review of the notes it looks like the defendant had some rapid heartbeat and was not, was asymptomatic at the time of the visit. The defendant indicated that he was there in part because he knew of someone who had similar rapid heartbeat and ultimately needed a pacemaker, so he was concerned and wanted to be examined.

And that is -- the packet of materials is fairly thick in large part because of some of the

2.2

testing that was done. But I didn't see any follow-up. I am not aware of any treatment that was prescribed. All of that is to say that I agree that Mr. Smith is 72 years old and I agree that he has a very -- his life experience is a bit limited in the sense that he has lived in Espanola almost his entire life and lived in the same house for at least 60 years, maybe longer. And I am, I can only imagine that going to prison would be stressful for him, and I understand all of that.

So when we talk about 3553, nature and the circumstances of the offense and the history and the characteristics of the defendant, you know, that is 3553(a)(1), so I have to look at the nature and the circumstances of the offense, too.

Here the jury concluded that the defendant recklessly shot at MG, who was on his property and she was shot in the temple and she died. So the jury determined that the defendant was reckless, acted without due caution and circumspection, as the jury instruction states. While it was not extreme recklessness, it was reckless. I think I noted at the last hearing that even if the defendant did not intend to shoot a person and kill that person, his shooting at head level was certainly reckless. And

```
1
    again somebody died.
               When I consider the nature and the
 2
 3
    circumstances of the offense, you know, I can think
 4
    of a lot of offenses where a 72-year-old would
 5
    probably be, it would be appropriate for something
 6
    less than incarceration.
 7
               But under these circumstances, I believe
 8
    that the offense was of the most serious nature.
 9
    When people die, that is a most serious offense.
10
               Now, I understand also when I consider the
11
    nature and the circumstances of the offense, I know
12
    this was at 1:00 in the morning. I know that the
13
    defendant was in his own home. I know he was
14
    awakened to what he thought may be a prowler.
15
    still, when someone shoots a weapon capable of
16
    killing someone, I think shooting at head level is
17
    of the, as I have already said, of the most serious
18
    order.
19
               When I take into consideration the
20
    defendant's history and characteristics, yes, he is
21
    72, he has no criminal history, he has no other
2.2
    conviction. I know that he lives alone. I know
23
    that he has lived in the same home for many years.
24
    I know that he has provided some information of
```

macular degeneration. But at the time he was

2.2

interviewed by Probation, the PSR said he had no known medical or mental health conditions. So it did not seem as though the macular degeneration was anything that was disqualifying or impeding his getting around.

I note that the medical records that were provided suggested that the treatment for that was glasses. So, again, I am not seeing anything that is beyond the Bureau of Prisons' ability to treat.

You know, as I look at the defendant's age, I looked at the cases that were cited. The White case from the Tenth Circuit was not a case where somebody died. It was not an involuntary manslaughter. It was failing to update sex offender registration. I can envision many kinds of cases, as I said earlier, where somebody who is age 72 could be appropriately punished short of a custodial sentence and I suppose if the defendant was here on a single count of failing to update his sex offender registration, that I might consider a noncustodial sentence.

The other cases that were cited are certainly examples of someone's age being taken into account in granting a variance, but once again, the count of conviction was much different.

In the *Flemister* case, it was possession and distribution of heroin and cocaine base.

2.2

In Bellamy it was conspiracy to distribute heroin. And in that case the individual was 69 and in poor health where the defendant here does not appear to be in poor health, though he is 72, but again the cases that were provided are not similarly situated defendants other than the fact of age.

So in looking at the 3553 factors, I look at the need for the sentence imposed to reflect the seriousness of the offense, promote respect for the law and provide just punishment for the offense.

And I don't need to be overly repetitious, but as I said already, MG died, was shot in the temple. Again, one of the most serious offenses, that I think does call for punishment that includes incarceration.

Deterrence, I, you know, I know there is a disagreement. The Government believes that deterrence is a factor because the defendant has shot at or near or at the time of other intruders on his property. I really don't know that deterrence is a major issue for Mr. Smith. I agree that he has let us know that he has used his gun to scare other, at least one other person away.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

available.

And, again, I think I pointed out last time, I understand that he has property, it is in a part of our State that, I guess, has more than its fair share of drug problems and people that may be passing through his property even though it is a motel or was a motel. It is not a motel that is open for business and surely the people that he has tried to chase off his property were not there because they intended to rent a room from him. So, you know, the deterrence is not one of the weightier issues in my assessment of the 3553 factors. Protection of the public from further crimes of the defendant, he has a crime-free history and so, I am concerned about protecting the public, but it is not like the defendant has a history of harming other people. And this one crime, this one conviction is serious, yes, but we would not have allowed him to be out on conditions of release if I felt that the public was in danger. Looking at the kinds of sentences available I do note that -- I have looked at the guideline range, certainly that tells me about a sentence, a range of incarceration that is

I know the defense has asked for

1 probation. 2 The PSR says at Paragraph 59 that 3 probation is not permitted for a Zone D offense, 4 which is where this one -- I am not saying I would 5 grant probation anyway, I am just telling you that I 6 have considered what is available, what kinds of 7 sentences are out there. 8 I have considered the need to avoid 9 unwarranted sentencing disparities. I frankly don't 10 see that imposing a low end quideline sentence 11 results in unwarranted sentencing disparities. I know age is an issue, but even the cases 12 13 the provided by the defense do not address a 14 situation where someone died, involuntary 15 manslaughter. 16 So I looked at the age issue and, by the 17 way, I did note that there was discussion in some of 18 the materials about recidivism not being a major 19 concern for older inmates. And my only observation on that point is that when this crime was committed, 20 21 the defendant, I believe, was 68 years old. 2.2 are already much older than what the materials would 23 tell us is a typical age for recidivism. 24 So my only point is, yes, the defendant is 25 72. Yes, it is a hard row to hoe, I get that.

on the other hand he was 68 when he committed this crime so it is not like he was a spring chicken when the crime was committed.

2.2

So I am, so what I am saying is I have given this very careful consideration. I think that taking everything into consideration, a custodial sentence is the appropriate one for this case. I think that if the defendant doesn't seem to be suffering any imminent medical conditions. I know that counsel has argued that the stress and the burdens of incarceration could certainly lead to deteriorating health. And while I understand that, at this point, anyway it is a bit speculative and if that were to occur the BOP is well equipped to handle medical issues.

And, secondly, I would assume knowing defense counsel and how diligent they are, that if something came along that would merit some motion or early release, I would not be surprised to see such a motion should there be sufficient support for it.

So those are my observations. I am not going to grant a variance based on age, and my intention is to impose a low end guideline sentence and recommend to BOP that they send him to a Federal medical center and take into consideration his age.

```
Anything else before I pronounce sentence?
 1
              MS. WILSON: Not from the Government.
 2
 3
              Thank you, Your Honor.
 4
              MR. ELSENHEIMER: Your Honor, if I may
 5
    only for purposes of the appeal and just for the
 6
    record, if I may. We object to the sentence on both
 7
    procedural and substantive grounds. We believe that
    there are obvious reasons for a variance from the
 8
 9
    sentencing quideline range, and imposing a quideline
10
    sentence is not sufficiently taking into
11
    consideration a lot of the factors that Your Honor
12
    mentioned. We believe those factors justify a
13
    variance and on that ground we object to the
    sentence. But, otherwise, I just want to say that
14
15
    for the record.
16
              THE COURT: Sure. So at this time I will
17
    invite you to the podium.
18
              The last time we were together I heard
19
    from everybody and I gave Mr. Smith an opportunity
20
    to address the Court, which he did. And if there is
21
    anything else that you want to say, Mr. Smith, I am
2.2
    happy to hear from you.
23
              THE DEFENDANT: I have nothing else to
24
    say.
25
              THE COURT: All right. So with that,
```

```
then, I will pronounce sentence.
 1
 2
               The Court adopts the Presentence Report
 3
    Factual Findings. The Court has considered the
 4
    sentencing quideline applications. The Court has
 5
    also considered the sentencing factors that are set
 6
    forth at 18 United States Code Section 3553(a)(1)
 7
    through (7).
 8
               The offense level is 18 and the criminal
 9
    history category is 1. The guideline imprisonment
10
    range is 27 to 33 months.
11
               The Court notes the defendant fired four
12
    shots at MG, striking her in the temple causing her
13
    death.
               So as to indictment 1:18-CR-03495-001 JCH,
14
15
    the defendant, Douglas D. Smith is committed to the
16
    custody of the Bureau of Prisons for a term of 27
17
    months.
               The Court will recommend to the Bureau of
18
    Prisons that the defendant serve his sentence at a
19
20
    Federal medical center.
21
               The Court will also recommend to the
2.2
    Bureau of Prisons that in classifying him, the Court
23
    recommends the most minimal status of confinement
24
    that the defendant qualifies for. And also
```

recommends that the Bureau of Prisons take into

account the defendant's age, both in his confinement and also in any programming.

2.2

The defendant is placed on supervised release for a term of two years. The defendant must comply with the mandatory and standard conditions of supervision. The following special conditions will also be imposed.

You must complete 40 hours of community service during your term of supervised release. The probation officer will supervise your participation in the program by approving the program, which agency, which location, frequency of participation, et cetera. You must provide written verification of completed hours to the probation officer, and this condition is imposed in lieu of a fine.

You must submit to substance abuse testing to determine if you have used a prohibited substance. Testing shall not exceed more than 60 tests per year and testing may include urine testing, wearing of a sweat patch and/or any form of prohibited substance screening or testing. You must not attempt to obstruct or tamper with the substance abuse testing methods. You may be required to pay all or a portion of the cost of the testing.

You must submit to a search of your

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

```
person, property, residence, vehicle, papers,
computers, other electronic communications or data
storage devices or media or office under your
control.
          The probation officer may conduct a search
under this condition only when reasonable suspicion
exists, in a reasonable manner, and at a reasonable
time for the purpose of detecting firearms, deadly
weapons, illegal substances or illegal contraband.
          You must inform any residents or occupants
that the premises may be subject to a search.
          You must not use or possess alcohol. You
may be required to submit to alcohol testing that
may include urine testing, a remote alcohol testing
system and/or an alcohol monitoring technology
program to determine if you have used alcohol.
          Testing shall not exceed more than four
tests per day.
          You must not attempt to obstruct or tamper
with the testing methods. You may be required to
pay all or a portion of the cost of the testing.
          You must not knowingly purchase, possess,
distribute, administer or otherwise use any
psychoactive substances including, for example,
```

synthetic cannabinoids, synthetic cathinones,

2.2

```
et cetera, that impair your physical or mental functioning whether or not it is intended for human consumption. These conditions are imposed due to the nature of the instant offense and the defendant's restrictions from possessing firearms, and ammunition as well as his history of alcohol and marijuana use.

You must not communicate or otherwise interact with the victim's family in this case, either directly or through someone else without the prior approval of the probation officer. And this condition is imposed to protect the victim's family from any unwanted contact.
```

The Court finds that the Mandatory

Restitution Act of 1996 is applicable in this case,
however, no claim for restitution has been made by
the victim's family in this case, therefore, none
will be ordered.

Based on the defendant's lack of financial resources, the Court will not impose a fine or a portion of a fine, however, in accordance with U.S. Sentencing Guideline Section 5E1.2(e), the Court has imposed as a special condition that the defendant complete community service.

The Court concludes that the total

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

```
combined sanction without a fine or alternative
sanction, other than the completion of -- the
defendant's completion of community service is
sufficiently punitive.
          The defendant will pay a special
assessment of $100, which is due immediately.
          The Court will permit voluntary surrender
in this case. The defendant is not a flight risk or
a danger to the community, so voluntary surrender
will be granted.
          And lastly pursuant to 18 United States
Code Section 3742(a), within four days of the entry
of judgment, you have the right to appeal the final
sentence of this Court. You have the right to apply
for leave to appeal in forma pauperis if you are
unable to pay the cost of an appeal.
          So with that I will ask counsel, is there
any reason that sentence should not be imposed as I
have stated it?
          Ms. Wilson?
          MS. WILSON: No, Your Honor, not from the
Government. Just a question clarification, though.
I know you did mention that self-surrender is
available. Is there a time period associated with
that?
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

```
THE COURT: Good point. I will ask you to
report to the U.S. Marshals Service immediately
after this proceeding in order to make arrangements.
Typically I require self-surrender in about a 60-day
period.
          Is that what would you recommend?
          THE PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, Your Honor,
probation would recommend 60 days.
          THE COURT: So I will recommend 60 days.
          MR. ELSENHEIMER: And just can I clarify,
it will be self-surrender at the facility that he is
designated, correct?
                     Well, I believe that he would
          THE COURT:
work with the Marshals Service on that.
          MR. ELSENHEIMER: That is usually my
experience as well.
          Can I ask in terms of the recommendation
of FMC, Federal Medical Center, could the Court also
include in that recommendation if the Bureau of
Prisons can't comply with that, that they notify the
Court?
        I ask for that because that way we would be
able to be aware of it and could make sure that
whatever facility he is going to has Mr. Smith's
medical records and things like that. I am told to
ask to include that, it is something for the BOP.
```

```
That is when we get notification before he is
 1
 2
    designated.
 3
               THE COURT: All right. So what you are
 4
    saying is you want it to include language that if
 5
    the defendant, I mean, if the Bureau of Prisons is
 6
    unable to place the defendant at a Federal medical
 7
    center, that you want the Bureau of Prisons to let
 8
    the Court know?
 9
               MR. ELSENHEIMER:
                                 Yes.
10
               THE COURT:
                           I am agreeable to that.
11
              MR. ELSENHEIMER:
                                 Thank you.
12
               MS. WILSON: I think that is fine.
13
    my communication from the BOP, it seems to me that
    if there is specific language related to the types
14
15
    of issues that are age-related macular degeneration,
16
    for example, and now this SVT that is arising, that
17
    that is something that they would be cognizant of so
18
    perhaps the order could include those concerns that
19
    we have now.
20
               THE COURT:
                          That is a good suggestion.
21
    The reason that I am recommending the Federal
2.2
    medical center, we will put in there not only age
23
    but also medical conditions of macular degeneration.
24
    And I don't know exactly whether to label, what
25
    specifically to label the heart issue as, but as
```

```
1
    long as I indicate that there is a heart issue that
    we want treated, I think that should suffice.
 2
 3
               MR. ELSENHEIMER: I think so.
               THE COURT: All right. I will do that,
 4
 5
    yes.
 6
               Anything else, then? Any other
7
    suggestions before I --
 8
               MR. ELSENHEIMER: I didn't answer your
 9
    main question. Aside from the objections we have
10
    already made for the record, no.
11
               THE COURT: All right. So with that,
12
    then, the Court will order sentence imposed as
13
    stated.
14
               And I wish you good luck, Mr. Smith, and
15
    we'll be in recess.
16
               (Proceedings concluded at 2:25 p.m.)
17
18
19
20
21
2.2
23
24
25
```

```
1
                    REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
 2
               I certify that the foregoing is a correct
 3
    transcript from the record of proceedings in the
    above-entitled matter. I further certify that the
 4
    transcript fees and format comply with those
 5
 6
    prescribed by the Court and the Judicial Conference
 7
    of the United States.
8
    Date: November 10, 2022
 9
10
11
                    PAUL BACA, RPR, CCR
                    Certified Court Reporter #112
12
                    License Expires: 12-31-2023
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
2.2
23
24
25
```